



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

DK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/092,297	06/05/98	BILLING-MEDEL	6107.US.P1-0

HM12/0706

STEVEN F WEINSTOCK
ABBOTT LABORATORIES
D 377 AP6D
100 ABBOTT PARK ROAD
ABBOTT PARK IL 60064-3500

EXAMINER

TURNER, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

15

DATE MAILED: 07/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/092,297

Applicant(s)

Billing-Medel

Examiner

Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit

1647



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on 6-5-00 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 6-5-00 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

- ☒ will not be entered because:

- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☒ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The proposed amendment introduces new limitations including "50% identity" and "SEQ ID NOs: 2-5" which require new search considerations, and raises the issue of new matter. Multiple typographic errors. Applicant's broader the scope of the claims which requires a new search. Claim 37 is not amended. The amendment to the specification raises issues of

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): new matter

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The proposed amendment has not been entered. All rejections are maintained for the reasons of record.

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 10-16, 25, 30, 33, 35, 38, 39, and 45-55

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

Patricia A. Duffy
PATRICIA A. DUFFY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

- ☒ Other Applicant's declaration filed 6-5-00 has been fully considered but is not persuasive in particular with respect to the claims reciting overlapping sequences and complements thereof. There is no evidence of correlation of any clones to the claimed Seq ID NOs, fragments or open reading frames of any clones